

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s): Donald C. Likes, Russell C. Brown
Assignee: Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.
Title: Communication Scheme-Independent Infrastructure
Serial No.: 10/085,965 Filing Date: February 28, 2002
Examiner: Kevin T. Bates Group Art Unit: 2155
Docket No.: TT3973 Customer No.: 53362

Austin, Texas
June 11, 2007

MAIL STOP AF
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW
AND STATEMENT OF REASONS**

Sir:

Applicant requests review of the Final Rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with the request. This request is being filed with a Notice of Appeal. The following sets forth a succinct, concise, and focused set of arguments for which the review is being requested.

CLAIM STATUS

Claims 1 - 6, 8 - 15, 17 - 23, 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,710,908 issued to Man (Man).

REMARKS

The present invention generally relates to a communication infrastructure that allows application programs within a software system to dynamically use services, such as receiving and transmitting messages, through a common application program interface (API). The communication infrastructure allows the specific communication schemes that are being used to be isolated from the application programs such that the application programs are not dependent upon a particular communication scheme.

Man relates to a method of transmitting data between application programs independent of any specific protocol. More specifically, Man discloses a protocol independent method of transmitting a data packet from a first application program executing on a first device which is interfaced to a LAN to a second application program executing on a second device which is interfaced to the LAN. A protocol independent interface (PII) program is initialized which determines which protocols are available for use, assigns an access line to each protocol that is available for use, assigns an access ID to the first application program, and creates mapping information that indicates a one-to-one correspondence between an access ID/access line pair and a block of protocol specific information which includes a protocol header having predetermined address data. A data packet is sent to the PII program together with the access ID of the first application program and a destination ID for the second application program, and one of the available protocols is selected to transmit the data packet. A block of protocol specific information is retrieved from the mapping information based on the access ID of the first application program and the access line corresponding to the selected protocol, and a transmission packet is formed which includes the data packet, the destination ID, and the retrieved block of protocol specific information. The transmission packet is then transmitted via the LAN.

Glass relates to communicating between agent objects in a computer network. Glass discloses when a first agent has a directive to meet with a second agent to exchange messages, the first agent moves to the host address and port number where the second agent is located. The first agent issues a request to the second agent for an encounter. If available, the second agent creates an encounter object that binds the first agent to the second agent for the duration of the encounter. The first agent, through an invoker, invokes a meet callback function to establish message exchanges between the first agent and the second agent through the encounter object. The first agent then instructs the second agent to terminate the encounter. Termination of the encounter frees up the encounter object for subsequent use within the computer network.

When discussing Applicants' arguments, the Examiner set forth

in Man, Column 2, lines 33 – 37, the reference teaches an access ID to identify the source application and a destination ID to identify the destination application. So by itself Man teaches the identifiers of both components. Glass teaches a system of sending messages between applications that includes identifying components using universal resource identifiers as seen in Column 4, lines 4 – 8 and lines 23 – 26. These URIs identify the objects or applications in the system uniquely. They include all of the name, path, and

port information included in the claimed limitation. So the limitations of the claim would be met by using Glass' system for identifying applications in the system to improve Man's teaching of access and destination IDs. (Final Office action dated April 18, 2007, Page 5.)

The portion of Man to which the Examiner cites sets forth:

A data packet is sent to the PII program together with the access ID of the first application program, and one of the available protocols is selected to transmit the data packet. (Man, Col. 2, lines 33 – 37.)

The portions of Glass to which the Examiner refers sets forth:

A conventional URL (uniform resource locator) syntax may also be used to refer to the object. For example, the new remote object with alias "Store1" is located at a remote host or IP address of "dallas" at port number "8000" with the above construction syntax. (Glass, Col. 4, lines 4 – 8.).

The Java class, its virtual class, and virtual object/agent 100 reside in a first host address and port number 102 (ALPHA:4000). A reference 104 is constructed that refers to the host address and port number (BETA:8000) and alias (Store1) of the new remote agent to be constructed (Glass, Col. 4, lines 22 – 26).

However, neither of these portions of Glass, nor anywhere else in Glass is there any teaching or suggestion of communicating a message from the first component to a second component where the communicating includes using *a first resource locator to identify the first component and using a second resource locator to identify the second component* much less such communicating where the first resource locator includes *a first resource locator communication scheme indication portion*, a first resource locator *network node name indication portion*, a first resource locator port identifier indication portion and a first resource locator path indication portion and the second resource locator includes *a second resource locator communication scheme indication portion*, a second resource locator *network node name indication portion*, a second resource locator port identifier indication portion and a second resource locator path indication portion, as required by claims 1, 10 and 18. These deficiencies of Glass are not cured by Man.

More specifically, Man and Glass, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a method which includes communicating a message from a first component to a second component where the message communicating includes using a first resource locator to identify the first component and using a second resource locator to identify the second component, much less where the first resource locator includes a first resource locator communication scheme

indication portion, a first resource locator network node name indication portion, a first resource locator port identifier indication portion and a first resource locator path indication portion; and the second resource locator includes a second resource locator communication scheme indication portion, a second resource locator network node name indication portion, a second resource locator port identifier indication portion and a second resource locator path indication portion, all as required by claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Man and Glass. Claims 2 - 9 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least this reason.

Additionally, Man and Glass, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a software system which includes a first resource locator for a first component and a second resource locator for a second component where the first resource locator includes a first resource locator communication scheme indication portion, a first resource locator network node name indication portion, a first resource locator port identifier indication portion and a first resource locator path indication portion and the second resource locator includes a second resource locator communication scheme indication portion, a second resource locator network node name indication portion, a second resource locator port identifier indication portion and a second resource locator path indication portion, all as required by claim 10. Accordingly, claim 10 is allowable over Man and Glass. Claims 11 - 17 depend from claim 10 and are allowable for at least this reason.

Additionally, Man and Glass, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a computer program product which includes using instructions to use a module to communicate the message from a first component to a second component of the software system where the using instructions include resource locator instructions to use a first resource locator to identify the first component and to use a second resource locator to identify the second component; and wherein the first resource locator includes a first resource locator communication scheme indication portion, a first resource locator network node name indication portion, a first resource locator port identifier indication portion and a first resource locator path indication portion and the second resource locator includes a second resource locator communication scheme indication portion, a second resource locator network node name indication portion, a second resource locator port identifier indication portion and a second resource locator path indication portion, all as required by claim 18. Accordingly, claim 18 is allowable over Man and Glass. Claims 19 - 26 depend from claim 18 and are allowable for at least this reason.

In view of the arguments set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, please telephone the undersigned.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically submitted to the COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS via EFS on June 11, 2007.

/Stephen A. Terrile/

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Respectfully submitted,

/Stephen A. Terrile/

Stephen A. Terrile
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32,946